



Qwest
607 14th Street NW, Suite 950
Washington, DC 20005
Phone 202.429.3120
Fax 202.293.0561

Melissa E. Newman
Vice President-Federal Regulatory

EX PARTE

Electronic Filing via ECFS

September 8, 2005

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

RE: *CC Docket No. 01-92* Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On September 7, 2005, Melissa Newman, John Kure and Robert McKenna of Qwest met, in separate meetings, with Scott Bergmann, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Adelstein, Michelle Carey, Legal Advisor to Chairman Martin, and Russ Hanser, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Abernathy, regarding the above named docket, specifically relating to the issue of "phantom traffic".

In the meeting, Qwest stated that the phantom traffic phenomenon is a major and immediate threat to the current intercarrier compensation regulatory structure and that steps needed to be taken immediately to deal with this situation. From Qwest's perspective, phantom traffic describes a number of situations in which the traffic is delivered to a terminating carrier in a manner that makes appropriate billing impossible, including transiting situations where the terminating carrier does not have enough information to bill the originating carrier, or terminating access traffic that has been erroneously designated as interstate when in fact it is jurisdictionally intrastate or has been erroneously designated as end user traffic.

Qwest asked the Commission to take four steps immediately to deal with the phantom traffic problem. First, the Commission should clarify that originating carriers may not lawfully conceal or alter any identifying information in a call that permits proper billing. Second the Commission needs to clarify that transit carriers are not liable to terminating carriers for traffic they deliver. Third, the Commission should clarify that the jurisdiction of any call is based on the end-points of the call. In the case of an end user to end user call, the end-points are the locations of the called and calling parties. In the case of an end user to or from ISP

September 8, 2005
Marlene H. Dortch
Page 2

call (including IP voice), the end points of the call are the calling(ed) party and the ISP POP. This is consistent with a proper interpretation of the “ESP exemption,” which simply treats an ISP/ESP POP as an end user premise for access charge purposes. Finally, the Commission should clarify that efforts by carriers to avoid access charges by including “information” or “processing” in their long distance calls in a manner that does not meet the strict tests for an information/enhanced service under the *Computer Inquiry II* rules are not compliant with the law and expose such carriers to, among other things, disconnection by injured LECs.

Sincerely,

/s/ Melissa E. Newman
Vice President – Federal Regulatory
Qwest

Copy (*via email*) to:
Scott Bergmann
Michelle Carey
Russ Hanser